

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 3/31/09, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-12, 18-23, 25-26, and 30-31 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Durham (6,330,566), Cui et al. (6,910,180), and Farber et al. (6,185,598),.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12, 18-23, 25-26, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Durham (6,330,566), in view of Cui et al. (6,910,180), hereinafter referred to as Cui, further in view of Farber et al. (6,185,598), hereinafter referred to as Farber.

4. Regarding claims 1 and 18, Durham disclosed a.) receiving a request for a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 100), the request originating at a client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 100); b.) determining whether the request for the resource includes a visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 –

column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 102); c.) responsive to the request including a visitor identifier: obtaining data associated with the visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104); and transmitting the requested resource to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 116); d.) responsive to the request not including a visitor identifier: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 114); sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 items 110 and 116), and transmitting the requested resource to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 116).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach determining that the client accepts visitor identifiers, and determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers. Cui teaches determining that the client accepts visitor identifiers, and determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in Durham because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the Durham-Cui combination does not explicitly teach responsive to the request not including an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier. Farber teaches responsive to the request not including an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3, pseudo code diamond: "reply is redirect?"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as

taught by Farber in Durham-Cui combination because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

5. Regarding claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 15, 17, and 20 Durham disclosed a method wherein the visitor identifier comprises a cookie (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

6. Regarding claims 3 and 19, Durham disclosed a.) receiving a request for a resource from a requestor, the requestor having an address (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); b.) determining whether the request includes a visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 102); c.) responsive to the request including a visitor identifier: c.1) obtaining data associated with the visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 106); and c.3) transmitting the requested resource to the requestor (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 116); and d.) responsive to the request not including a visitor identifier: assigning a visitor identifier from the requestor's address (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 112); and transmitting the requested resource to the requestor (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 116); and d.3) responsive to the request not including the indicator that step d.3) has been performed: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 114); sending to the requestor a redirection request including the new visitor identifier the redirection request being

adapted to cause the requestor to retransmit the request for the resource; and repeating steps a-d (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach determining that the client accepts visitor identifiers, and determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers. Cui teaches determining that the client accepts visitor identifiers, and determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in Durham because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the Durham-Cui combination does not explicitly teach determining whether the request includes an indicator that step d.3) has been performed; and sending an indicator that step d.3) has been performed. Farber teaches determining whether the request includes an indicator that step d.3) has been performed; and sending an indicator that step d.3) has been performed (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3, pseudo code diamond: "reply is redirect?"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in Durham-Cui combination because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

7. Regarding claim 5, Durham disclosed a method wherein determining whether the request for the resource included a visitor identifier further comprises the steps of:

comparing the visitor identifier with a range of valid visitor identifiers (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104), and, in response to the visitor identifier being outside the range of valid visitor identifiers (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104), indicating that the request did not include the visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104).

8. Regarding claim 7, Durham disclosed categorizing data sent with the request for the resource by at least one selected from the group consisting of a visitor identifier, a page identifier, and a time stamp (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

9. Regarding claim 9, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-d for a predetermined amount of time (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

10. Regarding claim 10, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-d until receiving a particular request for a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

11. Regarding claim 11, Durham disclosed a communication interface for receiving a request for a resource from a requestor and sending a visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); a cookie handler coupled to the communications interface for performing the steps of: a) determining whether the request includes a visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 102); b) responsive to the request including a visitor identifier: b.1) obtaining data associated with the visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 106); b.3) causing the communication interface to transmit the requested resource to the requestor (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); c) responsive to the request not including a visitor identifier: assigning a visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item

114); causing the communication interface to transmit the requested resource to the requestor (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); c.3) assigning a new visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 items 112, 114); causing the communication interface to send to the requestor a redirection request including the new visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2) the redirection request being adapted to cause the requestor to retransmit the request for the resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and a session controller coupled to the cookie handler for signaling a session end for a particular visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and a repository for: storing data sent with the request for the resource; responsive to the request including a visitor identifier, storing data associated with the visitor (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 3).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach determining that the client accepts visitor identifiers, and determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers. Cui teaches determining that the client accepts visitor identifiers, and determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in Durham because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the Durham-Cui combination does not explicitly teach determining whether the request includes an indicator that step c.3) has been performed; and sending an indicator that step c.3) has been performed. Farber teaches determining whether the request includes an indicator that step c.3) has been performed; and

sending an indicator that step c.3) has been performed (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3, pseudo code diamond: "reply is redirect?"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in Durham-Cui combination because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

12. Regarding claims 21, and 25, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request identifies the same resource identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

13. Regarding claims 22 and 26, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies an address (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request identifies the address identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

14. Regarding claim 23, Durham wherein sending a redirection request comprises sending a redirection request including an indicator that step c) has been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

15. Regarding claims 30 and 31, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-c until reaching a session expiration (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

**a. Hind et al. (2002/0143933) teaches a click-stream data collection technique.**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRADFORD F. FRITZ whose telephone number is (571)272-3860. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. F. F./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/Andrew Caldwell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2442